

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 10-12 and 14-16 stand in condition for allowance, claims 2, 5, 8, and 9 stand objected, and claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-7 stand rejected.

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are pending and under consideration.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because the amendment of claim 1 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised and the amendment does not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 226,756 to Mueller ("Mueller"). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In Mueller, a "hard" reset is provided to initialize the system logic and processor in computer system 100 to a predetermined state. See column 7, lines 49-63 of Mueller. For example, system hardware is reset to default values and system logic is set to appropriate initial values--memory size, system device recognition and other system default values. In the embodiment of FIG. 3, reset circuit 315 of the emulator 305 provides signal 335 to system logic 108 to indicate a hard reset. See column 7, lines 63-67, and column 8, lines 1-3 of Mueller.

According to page 7 of the Office Action, the system logic [108] controls the I/O devices and is therefore interpreted as equivalent to a peripheral control device. However, even

assuming, *arguendo*, that the system logic 108 would be interpreted to be equivalent to the peripheral control device recited in independent claim 1, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest “wherein said system reset signal output from said **system reset output section** is **supplied** to both chips of said central processing section **and** said peripheral control section,” emphasis added, as recited in independent claim 1. Rather, the hard reset is supplied to the processor in an interface 104. The interface 104 then provides the system logic 108 with a uniform hard reset signal at least a predetermined number of clock cycles before the processor included in the interface 104 becomes stable and ready to execute instructions, thereby allowing the system logic 108 sufficient time to complete sufficient initialization required for the hard reset. See column 7, lines 53-62 of Mueller.

In addition, in Mueller, the reset signal is generated when the emulator 305 receives an external reset signal. However, rather than teaching or suggesting, “a system reset output section generating and outputting a system reset signal on the **basis of an external reset signal and** an emulator reset signal **based on a reset instruction**...wherein said system reset signal output from said system reset output section is supplied to **both chips of said central processing section and said peripheral control section**,” emphasis added, as recited in independent claim 1, Mueller provides the reset signal from the emulator 305 for the processor 310 and the system logic 108, which is coupled to and may reference and/or modify data in memory 110. See FIG. 3 and column 3, lines 1-3 of Mueller.

Further, assuming, *arguendo*, that the push-button result is interpreted as the external reset signal, there is nothing in Mueller that teaches or suggests that based on the push-button reset **and** an emulator reset signal, a system reset signal output section“ is supplied to both chips of said central processing section and said peripheral control section,” as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, the reset signal from the emulator 305 is supplied to first to the processor 310 and then, the processor 310 supplied the signal to the system logic 108. See column 7, lines 53-62 of Mueller.

Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that Mueller fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1. It is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims be allowed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at page 6, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Mueller. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not

repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Because dependent claim 3 depends from independent claim 1, Mueller must teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments presented above supporting the patentability of independent claim 1 in view of Mueller are incorporated herein.

According to the Office Action, without providing any basis from a reference, it is conclusively asserted that "it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to put the system reset output section in the chip of the peripheral control section. It would have been obvious because Mueller discloses that his invention is intended to cover various equivalent arrangements within the scope." In addition, the Office Action recites case law asserting that "rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art." However, that assertion is proper so long as the properties and operating characteristics are the same between the cited reference and the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully assert that the benefits and properties of the presently claimed invention are not provided in Mueller.

Specifically, one of the many advantages of the system reset output section of the present invention is that the system reset signal may be distributed and supplied to separate chips (e.g., a processor and a companion chip) on a basis of the emulator reset signal and the external reset signal. However, the cited reference provides no such advantage. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that Mueller fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features of independent claim 1. It is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 and related dependent claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution


can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____ June 9, 2004 _____

By: 
Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501